

prescription drug benefit. We want to lower prices. There are ways to do it. We can do it now. I ask my colleagues to join with us in this effort.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

GERALD B.H. SOLOMON FREEDOM CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 3167. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3167) to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD, be added as a cosponsor of S. 1572.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. As I understand the parliamentary situation, time is controlled by Senator BIDEN and myself for half of the time remaining until 10:30, and Senator WARNER of Virginia controls the other half; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUGAR. Would that be approximately 12 minutes each at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is 11 minutes each.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, last evening in the debate, we had a good discussion of the need for the Senate to affirm through this action today that NATO should be expanded as a general principle. We also established that there ought to be very careful criteria for that expansion and examination of each of the candidates, as opposed to a done deal at the end of the trail, in which the Senate then receives a treaty without that careful examination country by country.

I have appreciated the colloquy with the Senator from Virginia, Senator BIDEN, and myself in which I think we established both of those facts—the desirability for a more robust NATO, and that would include more members, likewise—members that in fact carry their weight. As the Senator from Virginia pointed out, Americans may be involved in an article 5 declaration to defend those countries that would come in. In addition, we would anticipate that they would defend us.

Madam President, I point out that we are having this debate at this point very largely because the President of the United States has asked us to have it. Likewise, we have received correspondence from the Secretary of

State and the Secretary of Defense pointing out how imperative it is that we take this action to affirm that the United States stands solidly in terms of expansion of NATO and the careful consideration of its membership.

The act we discuss today also has money for seven candidates, on the presumption that these are serious candidates, that this money will make a difference in terms of training, interoperability of equipment, the general proposition as partners for peace. These nations have demonstrated great interest in the alliance and therefore deserve our help.

We pointed out last evening, in fact, the money was appropriated last December—the money is out there. This is the authorization of the money. Some have asked, is the authorization following too far behind? Our response is, no, if we take action.

This is why the President wants this action prior to his taking a very important trip to the summit with President Putin in Russia next week.

Madam President, I hope that today we will join in support of the Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001 because this bill provides assistance to the nations, as I mentioned. It gives us an opportunity for Congress to affirm our solidarity with our allies and our confidence in the future of the alliance.

I point out that our own President, George Bush, gave an important speech last year in Warsaw in which he said:

All of Europe's new democracies from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between should have the same chance for security and freedom.

He went on to say he believed "in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibility that NATO brings."

The cold war may be over, but the security and welfare of America and Europe are very closely linked, and our common goal must continue to be the building of a Europe which is whole and free.

I mentioned in the debate last evening my own visits last September to the three Baltic States—Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania—and Romania, and Bulgaria to visit with leadership about the specific criteria. That visit has been replicated by other Senators, most recently by our Ambassador to NATO, Mr. Burns, who has laid out a very concrete plan for each of those nations to affirm their interest and to give us a basis to judge that interest.

I finally point out that NATO is a truly remarkable institution because its members have joined together to assure that the ideals we share—we have a collective, moral, and military strength—are enhanced in the world at a time of the war on terrorism, at a time in which literally the dispute as to whether out of area or out of business has gone by the boards.

The war is out of area, by definition. The threats are all over the world. The need for flexibility and for more of us

to be involved is apparent. As President Bush pointed out, that means filling in the geography of Europe—Romania and Bulgaria and the southeast part—which is so important as a link not only to Greece and Turkey, our allies, but to the Middle East. The Baltic States were altogether mischaracterized by the former Soviet Union. They were always independent. We reaffirm that is the case. We see this as a cardinal principle of this legislation.

Finally, I point out that NATO is the alliance that places us in Europe. We are not a part of the European Union. We are a part of the transatlantic military alliance with headquarters in Brussels, with an American who has been in charge for many years. It is tremendously important. We appreciate Europe, and NATO is the major way in which we indicate that appreciation and participation.

The question now is, Should we expand that to countries that have taken on democracy, have taken on defense responsibilities, have shown through the Partnership for Peace their eagerness and their willingness to be with us?

My answer is in the affirmative, and I hope the Senate will vote overwhelmingly in favor of this action today that our President be fortified as he proceeds into important diplomacy.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I yield to our distinguished colleague from Texas 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from Virginia.

It is very important for the United States and Europe to have the kind of alliance that NATO has been. It has been the greatest defensive alliance in the history of the world, but I feel as if I am experiencing *deja vu* all over again.

The Senate is once again considering a measure to endorse the expansion of NATO without having satisfactorily addressed any of the same questions that loomed over the alliance 4 years ago when we made the first recent expansion.

In April of 1998, this body voted to expand NATO without articulating a rationale for NATO in the post-cold-war era, without calculating a reliable estimate of the cost of the expansion, without establishing an interalliance dispute resolution process, without evaluating the militaries of the respective candidates to see what they offered and where their problems were, and without determining how the alliance can effectively coordinate military action amongst an even larger and more unwieldy membership.

Here we are in 2002 with the same questions unanswered, and yet we are on the cusp of enlarging again. I have never thought that any of my concerns about the structure and purpose of NATO should be directed at any one

country. I do intend to vote for this resolution because I think we should expand the Partnership for Peace, we should get countries ready, we should try to bring their militaries up to speed, and the President wants this ability before he goes to Europe. I understand that, and I support the concept of an alliance with Europe.

What is the alliance's purpose? This is a defensive alliance to protect the democracies of Western Europe from the Communist threat of the East. That threat has evaporated. Our President is going to make an agreement with Russia in the next week that will have a mutual disarmament pact that will bring down our stash of nuclear weapons and their stash of nuclear weapons. We are friends with the Russians.

Today the threat for which NATO was first put in place is gone. We should have a strategic military alliance, but we need to talk about what functions it will have. If we are going to go offensive, as we did in Kosovo, how are we going to do it? Everyone knows the problems we had in trying to get unanimity when we were bombing Serbia. Everybody knows that was an almost impossible task. Yet here we are talking about adding new members without talking about what kinds of offensive alliances we are going to have.

In fact, as we are looking now at the hotspots around the world, some of the NATO allies agree with what we are doing in certain places; some have been less helpful. We need to have a purpose for NATO, or are we going to set our alliances according to the operations and interests of different parties involved so that we should stretch our dollars in a way that allows us the flexibility to determine which alliances we will have for any particular operation?

The cost of NATO is a big one for the United States. One-half of our permanent foreign forces are in Europe. We have a commitment to provide 25 percent of the NATO budget. We spend \$170 million to \$180 million in military construction for NATO, and we have a \$500 million commitment for U.S. military construction in NATO countries. So we are talking about almost \$1 billion, about three-quarters of a billion dollars in construction costs in European countries and/or NATO. That is a big part of our budget when we also have major commitments in the Middle East, major commitments in Korea in the DMZ, and major commitments, of course, ongoing in Afghanistan, the Philippines, and places regarding the war on terrorism.

We need to assess the costs before we go forward with this kind of process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 5 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Senator for yielding me the time. I think we are not ready to do this, but I certainly am not against expansion of NATO.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I rise to express my support for the Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001.

I support this bill because I support the enlargement of the NATO alliance to admit qualified nations and that is, at its essence, what this bill does. I would not support this bill if it supported enlargement without conditioning enlargement on nations being willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership. I also would not support this bill if it sought to identify one or more nations as being qualified for NATO membership. Since this bill does neither of those things, I support the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Madam President, I am please to join my distinguished colleague and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee to discuss the merits of the Freedom Consolidation Act.

Like Senator WARNER, I have been deeply troubled by aspects of NATO expansion and by what NATO expansion means in the post-cold-war era. NATO's original mission was clearly understood—we were standing up to the Soviet threat. Today, NATO's mission is very unclear, and the organization itself has become a bloated bureaucracy where politics often dictate military decisions.

NATO's involvement in the Balkans and the manner in which military operations were conducted during the Kosovo air campaign are prime examples of a NATO without a clear mission and with a broken decisionmaking structure.

Let me make one thing clear—I believe every nation deserves the right to self-determination. I am proud to state that I was an early advocate of Baltic independence from the Soviet Union even when some in the U.S. Government were opposed to the breakup of the Soviet Union. I have great admiration for the Baltic people—the Latvians, the Lithuanians, and the Estonians—they all suffered greatly and they deserve to be free nations as do all nations. I can understand their desire to join NATO and to integrate more fully into Western institutions. However, I believe that before we even consider expanding NATO, we must have a clear understanding of the mission of NATO.

For example, just the other day, NATO accepted Russia as a junior partner of sorts. Russia will now participate as an equal partner in many of the discussions and decisions of NATO. How do we reconcile the expansion of NATO to countries that Russia is opposed to admitting to NATO? We also have to consider Russia's own problems, such as the conflict in Chechnya—could NATO and the United States be pulled into the Chechnya conflict? We must also consider, frankly, whether NATO is relevant in today's world.

Hopefully, we are finding that coalitions for the sake of coalitions are not necessary. As European countries con-

tinue to downsize their militaries, the burden on the United States becomes greater and greater. Increasing its membership without significant reforms and a better understanding of its mission, does not make sense.

NATO is becoming a mini-U.N., an unwieldy and overgrown organization which will demand much of us, our commitment, our military, our national wealth, but which will return little to us for our investment. Although I understand a country's desire to join NATO, we must first address the many problems in NATO before we even consider expanding its membership. Therefore, I will vote against this legislation, not because I do not support the security needs of the countries of the Baltic and Eastern Europe, but because the mission of NATO and the organization itself need serious work.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam President, I rise today to voice support for Freedom Consolidation Act of 2002 of which I am an original cosponsor.

Over 5 years ago, as Governor of Virginia I visited Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary. I supported the admission of these Central European countries into NATO. And, wisely about 4 years ago the U.S. Congress enacted legislation that would ensure that Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were not the last emerging or reborn democracies to join the NATO. That was the right decision then and it is the right decision now. We should bring such aspiring democracies into our fold. And include them in the important decisions and responsibilities that affect the world as a whole. The nations seeking admittance have worked hard to meet the strict requirements. Many of these nations have undergone monumental changes from the days of communist occupation that have positively transformed them into freely elected, legitimate governments. Expanding the alliance to include nations that have made great changes in establishing human freedoms in their laws and practices is consistent with the 1949 NATO Treaty preamble which reads:

[The Parties] are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law . . .

It is in the best interest of the United States to nurture young democracies around the world. Coach them on the great values and principles stated in the NATO preamble. Working toward fulfilling the requirements of NATO's Membership Action Plan, shows the commitment aspirant nations have made to NATO's basic principles: collective defense; common values; and the promotion of democracy.

NATO membership is a catalyst for Western values, principles and actions. It is to the benefit of the United States and NATO to ensure the security of nations that desire a place among the community of democracies. The Freedom Consolidation Act of 2002 does not

predict which nations will be chosen, nor should it. Instead it sends a clear message to nations aspiring to freedom. That message is: Your efforts have been recognized and future progress will be rewarded with admittance to the most effective treaty organization in history.

It is very difficult to consider any issue related to international relations without viewing it in the context of the September 11th terrorist attacks. We must remember the nations that arose to stand with the United States mere hours after the horrifying attacks. When the United States needed support, it did not have to make calls, NATO was there—ready and poised to act along side of our nation. Passing the Freedom Consolidation Act is but one step we can take to ensure continued support through NATO. During this war on terrorism the United States has recognized that we cannot live alone in this world, especially in intercepting terrorist finances, gathering information, as well as assisting with personal, equipment, and military operation support. Countries all over the globe have been instrumental in our success and their assistance continues to expose the people that planned and carried out those vile acts.

The varied contributions of NATO allies and aspirants include: reconnaissance, refueling, Special Forces missions and many other significant duties that have aided our troops. This cooperative effort is a great example of the useful necessity of NATO. As we expand this just war into new regions, we need to develop new relationships and allies to ensure the safety of the world's democracies. I know there are many of my colleagues questioning the value of bringing new members into the alliance. There is sentiment that these nations are receiving a great benefit while adding little. I would dispute that argument; NATO is not a free ticket. All who aspire to join NATO work hard to make the kind of military, economic, and democratic reforms necessary to gain membership. This makes them a stable ally, and during these chaotic times we need committed partners. Many of those being considered for membership have proven their mettle. They have seen the cost of war, the value of freedom, and have stood strong with America.

As we consider new members we must also revisit the responsibilities of the existing nations. We must continue to urge our partners to prepare and improve their military capabilities. My colleague and good friend Senator JOHN WARNER said it best, "NATO is first and foremost a military alliance." NATO must address the growing imbalance between the United States and our European partners. It is not in the best interest of the alliance or European nations to have the United States shoulder such a large part of the military burden. Senator WARNER's insight is important and should be a top priority for the young democracies we

hope to bring into the strongest alliance on Earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, last December I watched carefully as the Senate received from the House this legislation which we are about to adopt. I urge Senators to vote for it. There will be one "no" vote, in my judgment. That is the Senator from Virginia. I do so for the following reasons: I believe this subject deserved debate, and that is why I interposed an objection on the UC to have this passed last December, 40-some millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to give to these nations.

If we were able to separate this legislation between authorization for these funds, I would vote for it because I think it is important we expend these funds for these nations which are trying very hard, some nine nations—although the money applied to only seven of the nine—seven nations which are trying to put together, within their respective countries, the fabric and the infrastructure necessary to hopefully qualify for NATO.

I am in favor of some expansion. I am not against any country. I am not for any country. The purpose of my objecting was I believed the Senate should have a debate before we passed it. I thought I was successful, but in the darkness of the Senate, as so often happens, the appropriators appropriated the money. So it was a hollow act on my part.

At long last we had a very good debate last night and I succeeded in my objectives: Clarifying with the two distinguished colleagues on the floor, the chairman and the ranking member, that this language, which I deem as an invitation to join—if one looks at the overall rhetoric, one sees it is very skillfully put together. It commits the Senate and the Congress to nothing other than the authorization of funds, but I think it could be misinterpreted and misleading to the aspirant nations, and the people, the journalists, and all who will cover the actions by the Senate and, indeed, the Congress now to approve that.

I say so for these reasons. The act is entitled the "Gerald B.H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001."

Turning to the dictionary, I read the meaning of "consolidation": To bring together into a single whole, unite and combine.

This is a bad choice of words, in my judgment. This sends a message that all nine, or all seven, should join. I think we lose sight of the purpose of NATO—it is a military organization—which is only if there is a compelling military rationale for additional members, and each member must be fully ready and prepared to take up their responsibilities under article 5, which says an attack on one is an attack on all.

So I will vote no, probably the only one, but I will continue to be a watch-

dog or, as some of my colleagues said, a "barnyard dog." I am going to make certain this Senate carefully reviews those credentials, and we will not have, I say with respect to my chairman and ranking member, suddenly a beautifully embossed document from the President of the United States as a consequence of meetings abroad, and here they are.

Do you think this Senate is going to go into it with that document for ratification and single out countries? We cannot do it that way. We have to do our work beforehand. I repeat, we have to do careful work. I will move in my committee, the Armed Services Committee. I hope my colleagues will do likewise. To those of us who can travel to these nations, I urge that we do so.

My motives and goals for opposing this legislation are very simple. I am not against an orderly, well thought out process leading to some measure of expansion; my fight is for preservation.

NATO is the most extraordinary military treaty in the history of mankind. Let's not sow the seeds of its demise.

This legislation being voted on today can be divided into two parts: one, authorize appropriations—which I support—for seven of the nine aspirant nations; and two, a compilation of rhetoric, primarily quotes extracted from speeches and documents, which form a matrix that can easily mislead people into believing that the United States Congress, by enactment of this legislation, is sending an invitation to one and all aspirants to join NATO. They need only RSVP in the affirmative.

I think we all agree that we are months away from deciding on which of the aspirant nations meet the criteria to be invited to join NATO. Therefore we should not be on the verge of adopting legislation that implies that aspirants "from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between" should be invited to join the Alliance.

I speak and vote against this legislation not as a sign that I oppose NATO expansion, but rather as a warning that we simply do not have the facts before us to render an informed judgement on the message this legislation sends across the Atlantic.

In closing, I would urge my colleagues to review the statement my good friend Mr. LANTOS made on November 7, 2001 in the House of Representatives. On page H7867 on that day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. LANTOS stated:

And I strongly endorse the statements of the 10 applicant countries that eventual NATO membership for all of them will be a success for the United States, for Europe and for NATO.

While I deeply respect my friend's good intentioned views, that statement makes it clear to me that the proponents of this legislation have already reached the conclusion that all applicants should be invited to join NATO. I believe it is too early in the process to reach that conclusion.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. How much time is available to the Senator from Delaware?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. How much is in the control of the Senator from Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute, fourteen seconds.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I will let the Senator from Virginia close.

I can assure my distinguished colleague from Virginia that Senator LUGAR, I, and others in the Foreign Relations Committee will have thorough hearings on this, as we did before.

This bill merely reaffirms the open-door policy for NATO enlargement which was first enunciated by the Clinton administration and now has been continued by the Bush administration. It does not authorize new funds that would throw the budget out of whack. It merely authorizes monies that have already been appropriated by the Arms Export Control Act.

Voting for this legislation does not indicate any Member's intention to vote for or against any potential aspirant to NATO. Exactly which countries will be invited by the alliance is a decision that will be made more than 6 months from now at a NATO summit in Prague, and thorough Senate debate on ratification of NATO enlargement will occur sometime at the end of this year and the beginning of the next. Everyone is going to have an opportunity to decide whether they are for or against this.

I remind my colleagues that 4 years ago, the Senate spent 7 lengthy days in floor debate on the ratification of admission to NATO of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. I managed that resolution, and I am certain the Senate will scrutinize the aspirants invited to Prague, just as we did in 1998. What the bill does mean is that the Senate authorizes the foreign military financing assistance to help those candidate countries meet the alliance's stringent membership requirements.

This bill will help NATO extend the zone of stability eastward and southward on the continent so that sometime within the next decade we will be able to say for the first time, I think, in all of modern history that we have a Europe whole and free.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Freedom Consolidation Act. I yield the floor to my friend from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my two colleagues, the chairman and the ranking member, for an excellent debate. Other Members have participated, but let us not forget that this is a military alliance, and in the event troops are called out, our men and women in the Armed Forces will occupy the foxholes, the tanks, the revetments, and take the risks alongside the others.

What concerns me about NATO is this—I quote not the Senator from Virginia but Secretary General Lord Robertson of NATO:

The United States must have partners who can contribute their fair share to operations which benefit the entire Euro-Atlantic community. . . . But the reality is . . . hardly any European country can deploy usable and effective forces in significant numbers outside their borders, and sustain them for months or even years, as we all need to do today. For all Europe's rhetoric, an annual investment of over \$140 billion by NATO's European members, we still need U.S. help to move, command and provision a major operation. American critics of Europe's military incapability are right. So if we are to ensure that the United States moves towards neither unilateralism nor isolationism, all European countries must show a new willingness to develop effective crisis management capabilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WARNER. This quote clearly indicates we have to be a watchdog of NATO as we begin to invite in more and more countries.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. I yield 1 minute to Mr. STEVENS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I merely want to say I endorse the statements made by the Senator from Virginia.

I want to explain my rationale for not supporting H.R. 3167, the NATO Expansion Act.

In 1998, I voted to support the last round of NATO enlargement which culminated in the accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

Over the past 2 years, at least two of these countries have not made much progress in restructuring and modernizing their military forces and infrastructure.

I am concerned that this bill provides an open invitation to the 10 candidate countries, irrespective of their readiness or qualifications.

We should strongly support countries into the alliance that are ready for NATO membership and that can significantly contribute to the European security mission.

We first need to determine what is the long-term mission of NATO, then assess how countries can contribute to that mission, and evaluate each candidate based on that overall criteria.

We need candidate states that can help support the alliance in maintaining peace and stability throughout the region.

For example, the United States flew over 60 percent of the combat missions in the Kosovo conflict. We need to look for capabilities that enhance the alliance and its members, not detract from it nor add substantial costs.

There is also a significant price tag for bringing nations into NATO that

are not ready for membership. The alliance, to which the United States already contributes about 25 percent of the costs, will have to provide financial assistance to help these countries modernize their Armed Forces and infrastructure.

We do not know the overall cost to do this, but it is my hope that we should carefully proceed with NATO expansion and weigh each nation's readiness to become a full partner in NATO.

I urge the member nations of NATO to proceed cautiously and address the issue of expansion with great care.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I come to the floor to express my support for H.R. 3167, the Freedom Consolidation Act. Last week I received a letter from Secretaries Powell and Rumsfeld expressing their support for this bill. President Bush has also requested that the Senate consider this bill before he leaves on his trip to Russia next Wednesday. I am pleased that we could accommodate his request, and I wish the President every success on the visit.

This is a straightforward bill. It cites earlier legislation leading up to the last round of NATO enlargement, quotes President Bush's pro-enlargement June 15, 2001, Warsaw speech, adds Slovakia to the countries eligible to receive assistance under the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and authorizes a total of \$55.5 million in foreign military financing, FMF, under the Arms Export Control Act for Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, and Romania.

Most importantly, this bill reaffirms the position of the United States on NATO enlargement: that the door to NATO membership remains open, and that those countries that are prepared to meet the obligations of membership—as it relates to defense capabilities and democratic and political readiness—are welcome to join.

NATO enlargement has enjoyed and continues to enjoy bipartisan support in the United States Senate. It is an issue that unites Democrats and Republicans. At a time when we and our allies are engaged in a global war on terrorism, we recognize more than ever the need for allies—and for new allies.

As we face a shared and multidimensional threat, we must recognize that each new ally brings substantial political, economic and military contributions to the effort in Afghanistan and around the world.

The terrorist attacks of September 11 underscore the need to consolidate the peace on the European continent so that North America and Europe, from, as the President has said, the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, can focus their energies on the new threats of the 21st century.

This is an important message for the President to take on his trip. But another part of the President's trip is also about closing a chapter from the 20th century.

The President announced Monday morning that he and President Putin will sign a new treaty to deal with the nuclear weapons left from the cold war.

The treaty limits the United States and Russia to no more than 1,700-2,200 deployed weapons by 2012.

Any time we can get an agreement to reduce the number of nuclear weapons deployed in the world, that is a positive step, and I commend the President for taking it.

But there are still a series of questions about that treaty that need to be answered. Does it require destruction of any existing nuclear weapons? Does it include provisions to secure Russian stockpiles? Does it spell out a transparent timetable for when each side must reduce the number of deployed weapons to the agreed upon level? Does it include any new verification provisions? And lastly, does it address the issue of tactical nuclear weapons?

I hope the President will use this historic trip to address these questions, which go to the heart of one of the principal security threats the United States faces today—the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the potential for those weapons to fall into the hands of terrorists.

So let's send the President off on this important trip with the important message contained in H.R. 3167—that we want to continue to remake and improve our relations with the whole of Europe, including Russia.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3167, and ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a copy of a letter, dated March 20, that Senator LOTT and I sent to the Romanian Prime Minister, and a letter to me from President Bush, dated April 11, on the same.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2002.

His Excellency ADRIAN NASTASE,
Prime Minister, 1, Victoriei Square,
District 1, Bucharest, ROMANIA.

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: We write to congratulate you on convening this important meeting with the other Prime Ministers of Europe's new democracies. It is an important stepping stone to the NATO summit in Prague next November.

At a time when the United States and its allies are engaged in a global war on terrorism, we are grateful for the support that you and your colleagues have provided. Americans remember who their true friends and allies are at times of war. The threat we face is a shared one, and we appreciate and value the substantial political, economic and military contributions that the countries represented in Bucharest are making to the coalition effort in Afghanistan and around the world. You are demonstrating in practice that you want to be allies of the United States. It is indeed a "Spring of New Allies."

At the NATO Summit in Prague in November, Alliance heads-of-state will be making an important decision about continuing the process of NATO enlargement. We want to take this opportunity to reiterate that NATO enlargement has enjoyed and continues to enjoy bipartisan support in the United States Senate. It is an issue that unites Democrats and Republicans.

We therefore look forward to the Prague summit and the opportunity to take the next step in building a Europe whole and free in alliance with the United States. We urge you and your colleagues to continue to work hard and devote the necessary resources to making your countries the strongest possible candidates. As President Bush put it in Warsaw last June, our vision is to extend the zone of democracy and security to as many qualified countries as possible from the Baltic to the Black Sea, including, as our allies in Greece and Turkey have argued, the important Southern dimension. The terrorist attacks of September 11th have only underscored the need to consolidate the peace on the continent so that North America and Europe can focus their energies on the new threats of the 21st century.

Mr. Prime Minister, once again, we commend you and your colleagues for your contributions to a strong, dynamic and more secure North Atlantic community. Working together we are confident that we can attain our collective vision of a Europe whole and free.

TOM DASCHLE.
TRENT LOTT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 11, 2002.

Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I have seen the letter you and Senator Lott sent to Romanian Prime Minister Nastase for the Bucharest Summit of the Vilnius-10 countries. Thank you for your leadership on this issue.

I strongly agree that NATO enlargement has been, and should remain, a bipartisan issue. We must work together on this. I noted the importance you place on the southern European candidate countries.

We have an historic opportunity to intensify reforms and consolidate freedom in nations that were once behind the Iron Curtain. We can do this while building a new NATO-Russia relationship. This is an opportunity that we cannot afford to miss.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BUSH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, of course, we agree with the Senator from Virginia. That is the purpose of this debate, to draw the attention of this Senate to a momentous decision that is to come. We must examine both armed services and foreign relations, and we pledge to do so, and the criteria of each of the countries. NATO is important. It must succeed. Therefore, we ask support for this resolution our President has asked us to give him.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) would vote "no."

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr.

ENZI), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHISON) the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 116 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Akaka	Dodd	Lott
Allard	Dorgan	Lugar
Allen	Durbin	McConnell
Baucus	Edwards	Mikulski
Bayh	Ensign	Murray
Bennett	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Bond	Frist	Reed
Boxer	Graham	Reid
Breaux	Gramm	Rockefeller
Brownback	Grassley	Santorum
Bunning	Hagel	Sarbanes
Burns	Harkin	Schumer
Byrd	Hatch	Sessions
Campbell	Hollings	Shelby
Cantwell	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Carnahan	Inouye	Snowe
Carper	Jeffords	Specter
Chafee	Johnson	Stabenow
Cleland	Kennedy	Thomas
Clinton	Kerry	Thompson
Cochran	Kohl	Thurmond
Collins	Kyl	Torricelli
Corzine	Landrieu	Voinovich
Crapo	Leahy	Wellstone
Daschle	Levin	Wyden
Dayton	Lieberman	
DeWine	Lincoln	

NAYS—6

Craig	Roberts	Stevens
Inhofe	Smith (NH)	Warner

NOT VOTING—9

Conrad	Gregg	McCain
Domenici	Helms	Miller
Enzi	Hutchinson	Murkowski

The bill (H.R. 3167) was passed.

Mr. LUGAR. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, all week long the average length of time it has taken to have a vote has exceeded 30 minutes. That is just too long. There is no way we are going to continue to accomplish as much as we need to accomplish before the end of next week if we have to be spending 30 and 40 minutes on a vote. We are going to have to start cutting off this time more aggressively. I want to put all colleagues on notice that we are not going to tolerate the extent to which our good will is violated as these amendments are voted upon.

Please come over and vote within the 15 or 20 minutes allotted for the vote. Extending it twice as long is just unacceptable and a real disservice to all our colleagues who are waiting to do their work.